

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,988	02/25/2004	Akishige Nakajima	501.43334X00	8960
20457 7	590 05/03/2006		EXAMINER	
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET			KALAM, ABUL	
SUITE 1800	OL VENTLENTII STRO		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ARLINGTON,	VA 22209-3873		2814	

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			()
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	P
	10/784,988	NAKAJIMA ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Abul Kalam	2814	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions are reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stated and the provision of the maximum statutory perions. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI: 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a cool of will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07</u>	' April 2006.		
, <u> </u>	his action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow			is
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.E). 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			,
4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application	on.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-17 is/are withdra	wn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	aror election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami			
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ a			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			. D
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr			(a). ·
	Examiner: Note the attache		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei	ign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority docume		Application No.	
2. Certified copies of the priority docume3. Copies of the certified copies of the p			
application from the International Bure		The state of the s	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a l		received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date	
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/25/04</u>. 		Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Species I, claims 1-6, in the reply filed on April 7, 2006 is acknowledged. Thereby claims 7-17 are withdrawn from further consideration. Furthermore, claims 18 and 19 were cancelled in the preliminary amendment filed on February 25, 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In lines 11-12, the limitation, "said fingers positioned at both ends of said second electrode is wider than a width of each of said fingers positioned between said both ends," is unclear. The claim does not clearly and distinctly specify whether the claimed "said fingers," recited in lines 11 and 12, are of the first electrode or second electrode. Thus, the scope of the limitation is indeterminate. Claims 2-6 are dependent on claim 1, and thus are also rejected.

In line 3 of claim 3, the limitation, "said fingers positioned at both ends," is unclear because the claim does not specify whether the claimed "said fingers" are of the first electrode or second electrode.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lin (US 5,955,763).

With respect to claim 1, Lin teaches a semiconductor device having a semiconductor chip formed with a transistor (fig. 1),

wherein said transistor has a first electrode ("drain electrode"), a second electrode ("source electrode"), and a control electrode ("poly gate"),

wherein each of said first and second electrodes is constructed by a base portion and a plurality of fingers projected in a direction orthogonal to said base portion,

wherein one of the fingers of said first electrode is disposed between neighboring two fingers of said second electrode (col. 4, Ins. 23-26),

wherein said second electrode is connected to a fixed potential (col. 4, lns. 48-51), and

wherein a width of each of said fingers positioned at both ends of said second electrode ("source electrode) is wider than a width of each of said fingers positioned between said both ends (fig. 1, the office interprets the claimed said fingers are of the second electrode, which Lin describes as the source electrode).

With respect to claim 3, Lin teaches wherein the width of said base portion of said second electrode is wider than the width of each of said fingers positioned at both ends (fig. 1, the office interprets the claimed said fingers are of the second electrode, which Lin describes as the source electrode).

With respect to claim 4, Lin teaches wherein said first electrode is a drain electrode, said second electrode is a source electrode, and said control electrode is a gate electrode (fig. 1).

With respect to claim 6, Lin teaches wherein said base portions of said electrodes extend in the same direction, and said fingers of said electrodes extend in a direction orthogonal to an extending direction of said base portions (fig. 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin '763.

With respect to claim 2, Lin teaches the semiconductor device as set forth above in claim 1, including: wherein said second electrode ("source electrode") has at least four fingers (fig. 1).

Thus, Lin teaches all the limitations of the claim with the exception of disclosing: wherein the width of each of said fingers of said second electrode positioned at both

ends is equal to or wider than a sum of the widths of said plurality of fingers positioned between said both ends.

However, the limitation, "wherein the width of each of said fingers of said second electrode positioned at both ends is equal to or wider than a sum of the widths of said plurality of fingers positioned between said both ends," is not critical. Note that the specification contains no disclosure of either the *critical nature of the claimed* "width of each of said fingers of said second electrode positioned at both ends is equal to or wider than a sum of the widths of said plurality of fingers positioned between said both ends," or any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is aid to based upon particular chosen dimension or upon another variable recited in a claim, the Applicant must show that the chosen dimension are critical. *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Why is it critical for the fingers of said second electrode positioned at both ends of said second electrode to be wider than the sum of the widths of the plurality of fingers? Why must the fingers at the ends be wider than the **sum of the widths** of the fingers, rather than **a width** of each of the fingers?

3. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin '763 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kazior et al. (5,343,071).

With respect to claim 5, Lin teaches the semiconductor device as set forth above in claim 1, with the exception of explicitly disclosing: wherein said first electrode is a

collector electrode, said second electrode is an emitter electrode, and said control electrode is a base electrode.

However, Kazior discloses a semiconductor device, such as an MMIC, formed with a transistor, such as a heterojunction bipolar transistor (HBT). Kazior further discloses transistors formed with interdigitated electrodes, including a collector electrode, an emitter electrode, and a base electrode (col. 1, lns. 42-50),

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the semiconductor device of Lin to have a collector, an emitter, and a base electrode as taught by Kazior, because such a structure would have been considered a mere substitution of art-recognized equivalent values, MPEP 2144.06.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abul Kalam whose telephone number is 571-272-8346.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9 AM - 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael M. Fahmy can be reached on 571-272-1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AK 4/26/06

> ANH D. MAI // PRIMARY EXAMINER